

Reliability and Validity of Turkish Version of Sexual Coercion in Intimate Relationships Scale

Rengin GÜVENÇ^{ID}, Münevver HACIOĞLU YILDIRIM^{ID}, Ejder Akgün YILDIRIM^{ID}

Bakırköy Prof. Dr. Mazhar Osman Research and Training Hospital for Psychiatric and Neurological Diseases, İstanbul, Turkey

ABSTRACT

Introduction: In this study, we aimed to investigate the validity and reliability of the Sexual Coercion in Intimate Relationships Scale in the Turkish population.

Methods: 353 women aged 18-65 were included in the study. In addition to the 34 questions in the original scale, 8 questions from other scales in the literature were added, which were not included in the scale. Sociodemographic Data Form, World Health Organisation Women's Violence Against Partner Questionnaire, The Severity of Violence Against Women Scale, Sexual Experiences Survey-Short Form Victimization, and Relationship Stability Scale were also applied to the participants.

Results: 3 items were removed due to low factor load values in the analyzes performed with the Varimax rotation method. The values

obtained as a result of exploratory factor analysis made over 39 items were 21.718%, 24.424%, and 12.901%, respectively. This explained 53.88% of the total variance. The value of the scale was determined in high-level reliability (Cronbach's alpha:0.96). Subdomains were similar to the original survey. Its correlation with other scales showed a significant and strong relationship.

Conclusion: In our study, the necessary analyzes for the quality of the measurement tool were applied and this scale is found psychometrically reliable and valid. This scale can evaluate all partner sexual violence, such as subtle and physical force types and their frequency.

Keywords: Intimate partner violence, women, validity, reliability

Cite this article as: Güvenç R, Hacıoğlu Yıldırım M, Yıldırım EA. Reliability and Validity of Turkish Version of Sexual Coercion in Intimate Relationships Scale. Arch Neuropsychiatry 2022;59:151-157.

INTRODUCTION

The World Health Organization (WHO) defines violence as the use of force and power to cause physical or mental injury or loss. Violence against women a universal problem; regardless of geographical region, education level, and development level it is a human rights issue and a form of discrimination (1). Despite the legal measures taken, the rate of violence against women in our country remains high. According to the results of a research conducted by Hacettepe Population Institutes, on behalf of the Ministry of Family and Social Policies (MoFSP), between 2013 and 2014; 36% of women stated that they were exposed to physical violence, 30% to economic violence, and 12% to sexual violence by their partners and spouses (2). It can be much difficult for people who experience sexual violence to share their experiences with someone else and to reach social support because of the embarrassment (3-5). This difficulty is greater in partner sexual violence.

In studies on violence against women, partner sexual violence remains in the background. Researchers often do not question partner sexual violence in all its dimensions and do not examine in detail the health problems that causes (6). In studies on partner sexual violence, only legally defined types of sexual violence, including rape are questioned (2,7,8). However, sexual violence in intimate partner relationships occurs more frequently with implicit forms of violence, than physical bullying within the legally defined concept of rape. The content of the implication and threat can be: "he would receive opportunities or gifts in return

Highlights

- The Turkish reliability validity of a detailed scale of sexual violence was investigated.
- Implicit sexual violence, that is frequently seen, can also be evaluated in the scale.
- We hope that it will contribute to researchers in examining the effects of violence on health.

for sexual intercourse"; "he would have sex with others or he wouldn't provide some opportunities for her if she doesn't have sexual intercourse" or "if she doesn't have sexual intercourse, it would be an indication that she doesn't love him or isn't committed to him".

There are very few studies investigating exposure to partner sexual violence in Turkey. In the current studies, only physical force and physical threat sexual violence types have been questioned (2,8,14). In the scales measuring partner violence in our country, a limited attention is given to sexual violence, and these parts do not include subtle types of sexual violence, which are the most common types of partner sexual violence (2,15). There is no scale measuring partner sexual violence in all its dimensions and frequency of violence in Turkey.

This study aims to perform the Turkish validity and reliability analyzes of the Sexual Coercion in Intimate Relationship (SCIRS), which was developed by Shackelford and Goetz in 2004 (16).

With this study, sexual violence in close partner relations with SCIRS in Turkey would be questioned in all its dimensions and its psychological effects will be examined.

METHODS

Working Group

480 female and 130 female patient relatives who were admitted to the Bakirkoy Prof. Dr. Mazhar Osman Mental Health and Neurological Diseases Training and Research Hospital therapy center between November 2020 and February 2021 were invited to the study. Among 610 people, 370 consecutive people, between the ages of 18-65, at least primary school graduates, living with their partner for a year, willing to participate in the scales to be applied in the study, and who gave written informed consent after the purpose of the research was explained, were included in the study. Other invited persons' reasons for not participating were that "they did not have time to participate in the research", and "they had reservations about answering questions about sexuality and violence", and "they did not have a partner". 10 people who included in the study left the study voluntarily while answering the scales. 7 people were excluded from the study group because they filled in the form incompletely.

Introduction of the Materials and Scale Used in the Research

Sexual Coercion in Intimate Relationships Scale (SCIRS): SCIRS was developed by Shackelford and Goetz in 2004 (16). The scale was developed with the determination of sexual violence in intimate partner relationships is more common with implied verbal manipulations rather than physical bullying or the threat of physical bullying. The scale groups partner sexual violence into three subtypes as resource manipulation/violence (RM/V), commitment manipulation (CM), and defection threat (DT), and provides a measurement by scoring according to the frequency of the violence experienced.

Socio-demographic and Clinical Data Form: It is a structured questionnaire developed to be used in this study to determine the socio-demographic and clinical characteristics of the cases.

Sexual Experiences Survey-Short Form Victimization (SES-SFV): The scale was developed by Koss et al. in 2006 (17). SES-SFV consists of ten questions and the frequency of victimization is questioned. The Turkish reliability and validity of the scale were performed by Tuz et al. in 2015 (15).

The Severity of Violence Against Women Scale (SVAWS): The scale was developed by Marshall in 1992 (18). SVAWS consists of short sentences with 46 items. The Turkish reliability and validity of the scale were performed by Tuz et al. in 2015 (15).

World Health Organisation Domestic Violence against Women Questionnaire (WHO-DVWQ): WHO used a 1204-question form in a study conducted in 12 countries in 2005 to measure women's health and partner violence that women are exposed to (19). This form was adapted into Turkish by MoFSP and used to measure violence against women between 2008 and 2014 (2). In our study, 9th section of this form that question partner violence against women and controlling behavior exposure were used.

Relationship Stability Scale (RSS): The scale was developed by Rusbult et al. in 1998 (20). The scale consists of 30 items: Relationship Satisfaction (RS) (10 items), Relationship Investment (10 items), Evaluation of the

Quality of Options (10 items). The Turkish validity and reliability analysis of this scale were performed by Büyüksahin et al. in 2005 (21). In our study, only the RS part of the scale was used.

Ethical Issues Followed in the Scale Adaptation Process

Dr. Shackelford, one of the developers of the original scale, was contacted and permission was obtained for the adaptation to Turkish. The Participants were informed that all information was provided on a voluntary basis and would be used for research purposes only. Ethical permission was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee of İstanbul Bilgi University with the decision number 2020-40016-79 on 19.10.2020.

Translation of the scale into Turkish

After obtaining the necessary permissions for the use of SCIRS, 8 additional items were added by obtaining the approval and opinions of the scale owners from other scales (17,18) in the literature. the 35th, 36th, 37th, 40th, and 41st items included forms of digital violence that emerged with the increasing use of social media and technologies as the United Nations Women's Commission has drawn attention in recent years (22). The 38th and 39th items were about the threat of separation and the 42nd item was about the use of sexual violence by impairing the individual decision-making ability. These items were adapted to the language and nature of the scale and added to the scale as follows.

- 35) My partner forced me to do something that I found not sexually appropriate.
- 36) My partner showed or made me watch a pornographic picture or video, even though I stated that I did not want it.
- 37) My partner took a photo/video of me in underwear, nude or during sex without my consent
- 38) My partner hinted he would end our relationship if I did not have sex with him.
- 39) My partner threatened to end our relationship if I did not have sex with him.
- 40) My partner hinted he would breach the privacy of our sexual life with my relatives if I did not have sex with him.
- 41) My partner threatened to breach the privacy of our sexual life with my relatives if I did not have sex with him.
- 42) My partner encouraged me to use alcohol and other substances to have sex with me, even though he knew that I did not want to.

The Turkish scale was translated back into English by another psychiatrist who is an expert in both English and mental trauma studies. This scale, which was translated from Turkish to English was compared with the original English scale and revised in terms of suitability for Turkish. The Turkish scale was given its final form by submitting it for the approval of the researchers who developed the scale.

Analysis of Data

Various statistical analyzes were carried out for the adaptation of the scale to Turkish. First of all, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was applied to examine the factor structure of the scale's scores obtained from women exposed to violence. In order to evaluate the factor analysis, the Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO) value is examined and the Bartlett test is also performed. In literature, it is expected that the KMO coefficient will be higher than 0.60 and the Bartlett sphere test will be significant as an indicator of the suitability of the data for factor analysis (23,24).

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted on the factor structure determined by EFA. With CFA, it is aimed to test whether the distribution of the variables over the determining factors complies with the preliminary expectations (25). Chi-Square Goodness test, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual, Goodness of

Table 1. Findings on Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

Item No	ACTS	Factor 1: xxx RM/V	Factor 2: yyy DT	Factor 3: zzz CM
I1	My partner hinted that he would withhold benefits that I depend on if I did not have sex with him.	0.746		
I2	My partner threatened to withhold benefits that I depend on if I did not have sex with him.	0.634		
I3	My partner withheld benefits that I depend on to get me to have sex with him.	0.750		
I4	My partner hinted that he would give me gifts or other benefits if I had sex with him.	0.388		
I5	My partner gave me gifts or other benefits so that I would feel obligated to have sex with him.	0.527		
I6	My partner reminded me of gifts or other benefits he gave me so that I would feel obligated to have sex with him.	0.546		
I7	My partner persisted in asking me to have sex with him, even though he knew that I did not want to.	0.521		
I9	My partner initiated sex with me when I was unaware (for example, I was asleep, drunk, or on medication) and continued against my will.	0.662		
I10	My partner threatened to physically force me to have sex with him.	0.596		
I11	My partner physically forced me to have sex with him.	0.691		
I12	My partner made me feel obligated to have sex with him.	0.507		
I14	My partner threatened to have sex with another woman if I did not have sex with him.	0.628		
I15	My partner told me that other couples have sex more than we do, to make me feel like I should have sex with him.	0.630		
I22	My partner threatened violence against me if I did not have sex with him.	0.732		
I23	My partner threatened violence against someone or something I care about if I did not have sex with him.	0.703		
I35	My partner forced me to do something that I found not sexually appropriate.	0.513		
I36	My partner showed or made me watch a pornographic picture or video, even though I stated that I did not want it.	0.564		
I37	My partner took a photo/video of me in underwear, nude or during sex without my consent.	0.695		
I38	My partner hinted he would end our relationship if I did not have sex with him.	0.557		
I39	My partner threatened to end our relationship if I did not have sex with him.	0.667		
I13	My partner hinted that he would have sex with another woman if I did not have sex with him.		0.671	
I16	My partner hinted that he might pursue a long-term relationship with another woman if I did not have sex with him.		0.828	
I17	My partner threatened to pursue a long-term relationship with another woman if I did not have sex with him.		0.625	
I24	My partner hinted that other women were interested in a relationship with him, so that I would have sex with him.		0.829	
I25	My partner told me that other women were interested in a relationship with him, so that I would have sex with him.		0.867	
I26	My partner hinted that other women were interested in having sex with him, so that I would have sex with him.		0.836	
I27	My partner told me that other women were interested in having sex with him, so that I would have sex with him.		0.858	
I28	My partner hinted that other women were willing to have sex with him, so that I would have sex with him.		0.880	
I29	My partner told me that other women were willing to have sex with him, so that I would have sex with him.		0.872	
I31	My partner told me that it was my obligation or duty to have sex with him.		0.455	
I32	My partner hinted that I was cheating on him, in an effort to get me to have sex with him.		0.601	
I33	My partner accused me of cheating on him, in an effort to get me to have sex with him.		0.692	
I8	My partner pressured me to have sex with him against my will.			0.633
I18	My partner hinted that if I were truly committed to him I would have sex with him.			0.697
I19	My partner told me that if I were truly committed to him I would have sex with him.			0.648
I20	My partner hinted that if I loved him I would have sex with him.			0.742
I21	My partner told me that if I loved him I would have sex with him.			0.733
I30	My partner hinted that it was my obligation or duty to have sex with him.			0.483
I34	My partner and I had sex, even though I did not want to.			0.649
Total Variance Explained = 5.04%		21.72%	24.42%	12.90%

CM: Commitment Manipulation; DT: Defection Threat; EFA: Exploratory Factor Analysis; RM/V: Resource Manipulation/Violence

Table 2. Sexual coercion in intimate relationships scale-turkish confirmatory factor analysis results

Examined Fit Indices	Fit Indices		Obtained Index Value	Results
	Perfect	Acceptable		
χ^2/sd	$0 \leq \chi^2/sd \leq 2$	$2 \leq \chi^2/sd \leq 3$	2.83	Acceptable fit
RMSEA	$0.00 \leq RMSEA \leq 0.05$	$0.05 \leq RMSEA \leq 0.08$	0.068	
SRMR	$0.00 \leq SRMR \leq 0.05$	$0.05 \leq SRMR \leq 0.10$	0.065	
GFI	$0.95 \leq GFI \leq 1.00$	$0.90 \leq GFI \leq 0.95$	0.90	
AGFI	$0.90 \leq AGFI \leq 1.00$	$0.85 \leq AGFI \leq 0.90$	0.87	
PGFI	$0.95 \leq PGFI \leq 1.00$	$0.50 \leq PGFI \leq 0.95$	0.71	

AGFI = Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index; EFA= Exploratory Factor Analysis; GFI = Goodness of Fit Index; PGFI = Parsimony Goodness of Fit Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual

Table 3. Correlation table of scales

	RS	WHO-CB	SVAWS	SES-SFV	SCIRS	WHO-DVWQ
RS	1					
WHO-CB	-0.559**	1				
SVAWS	-0.660**	0.630**	1			
SES-SFV	-0.610**	0.596**	0.800**	1		
SCIRS	-0.620**	0.602**	0.780**	0.821**	1	
WHO-DVWQ	-0.660**	0.630**	1.000**	0.800**	0.780**	1

*The correlation is significant at the $p < 0.01$ level (double-tailed).

SCIRS = Sexual Coercion in Intimate Relationships Scale, SES-SFV = Sexual Experiences Survey-Short Form Victimization; SVAWS = Severity of Violence Against Women Scale, RS=Relationship Satisfaction; WHO-DVWQ=World Health Organisation Domestic Violence against Women Questionnaire; WHO-CB= World Health Organisation-Controlling Behaviours

Fit Index, Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index, and Parsimony Goodness of Fit Index were used to demonstrate the adequacy of CFA.

The reliability coefficient of the data was calculated with the Cronbach α value. In order to determine the adequacy of the items in the scale related to distinguishing individuals, the corrected item-total correlation was calculated and 27% lower-upper group comparisons were made.

SPSS 22.0 package program was used for EFA, Cronbach alpha, and item analysis, and Lisrel 8.54 was used for CFA.

RESULTS

The mean age of the participants was 35.5 ± 8 years. 20.4% were primary school graduates, 21.2% were high school graduates, 58.4% were undergraduate and graduate students. 99.7% of the participants were married, 0.03% were single, and lived in the same house with their partner. 99.4% of the participants reported that they and/or their partners did not have alcohol and psychoactive substance use problems, and 0.36% reported that they and/or their partner frequently used alcohol and/or psychoactive substances. The rate of women who were exposed to any type of sexual violence by their partners was 41.4%.

Findings on Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

While the KMO value of the scale was estimated as 0.852-0.793, Bartlett's spherical test was significant ($\chi^2=1538.59$, $p < 0.01$). 40th, 41th, 42nd items that were below the 0.30 factor load criterion determined for eligibility as a result of the analyzes made with the Varimax rotation method. These items were removed from the survey (40-My partner hinted he would breach the privacy of our sexual life with my relatives if I did not have sex with him., 41-My partner threatened to breach the privacy of our sexual life with my relatives if I did not have sex with him., 42-My partner encouraged me to use alcohol and other substances to have sex with me, even though he knew that I did not want to.). After these 3 items were

removed, a three-factor structure emerged as a result of the principal components analysis made on the remaining 39 items.

The data was also supported by the parallel analysis method developed by Horn (26). Considering the contents of the items collected in the factors and the theoretical structure, the first factor consisting of 20 items was named "xxx", the second factor consisting of 12 items was named "yyy", and the third factor consisting of 7 items was named "zzz". These three factors explain 53.88% of the total variance with values of 21.718%, 24.424%, and 12.901%, respectively (Table 1).

Findings on Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

The fit indices evaluated in this study, the criterion values for these indices, and the fit index values obtained from the CFA are given in Table 2.

When the values in the literature and the CFA results are compared, it is seen that all of them are compatible at an acceptable level. The results show that the model is in good agreement (Table 2).

Cronbach's alpha value was 0.96.

The correlation of SCIRS with other scales showed a significant and strong relationship (Table 3).

DISCUSSION

It is aimed to evaluate the validity and reliability of SCIRS on Turkish society in this study.

The subgroup distributions in the original scale and this study were the same. It was distributed in three subgroups as 1.RM/V, 2. DT, 3. CM.

The distinction in gender roles in our country is as sharp as in the rest of the world (27). As noted in the studies of Vovodinos et al. and Arcienego et al., gender norms assign women a passive, fragile, self-sacrificing role

that needs protection, does not demand sexuality, and is unwelcome to have premarital sex. On the other hand, males are assigned as dominant, protective, powerful, and always sexually demanding roles. Gender norms also bless the institution of marriage and require women to play a tolerant role in marriage and to always approve of her husband to avoid any problems. These roles, which include power imbalances, pave the way for partner violence unfortunately (28). Since the distinction is sharp in our country, in order not to miss any details, all other sexual violence scales (13,18,30) in the literature were scanned. The eight questions that were not included in the SCIRS were added to the scale with the consent and opinions of the researchers who developed the SCIRS.

Five of the newly added items were included in the RM/V group as types of sexual violence involving bullying. Three items were not included in the factor analysis. It is known that it is much difficult to define sexual violence within a marital relationship (12,31,32). However, there is conflicting information in the literature regarding the effect of being married or not, on sexual violence in intimate partner relationships. In a study, it was shown that women who are not married and do not live with their parents are more likely to be exposed to partner sexual violence (33). In the study conducted by MoSFP in Turkey, it was determined that being married increases exposure to all forms of violence, and divorced women have the highest exposure (2). The fact that the majority of the participants in this study were married may have created bias in the exposure rates. For example, exposure to the type of sexual violence in the 40th and 41st items related to spreading rumor has been detected very low. Gender roles impose that women experience their first sexual intercourse in a marital relationship (27, 34–36). It is known that forcing sexual intercourse during sex before marriage and the threat of spreading rumor about sexual intercourse is frequently used as a form of sexual violence (33–37). In the marital relationship, the woman is often defined with the concepts of property and honor, and so spreading rumor can harm the man himself (34). In this study, since the majority of the participants were married, it was thought that the type of sexual violence related to spreading gossip in these items was not frequent and could not be included in the factor analysis. The 42nd item, which is related to alcohol and substance use, was thought to have not been included in the factor analysis because alcohol and substance use of the women and their partners were very low. These three items were not included in the factor analysis due to the small sample size, which is a limitation of this study. It is thought that it is important to question these forms of sexual violence in clinical interviews with unmarried people.

While the 12th and 15th items were in the CM subgroup in the original scale, they were included in the RM/V subgroup in this study. The fact that definitions such as 'necessity, obligation' includes the concept of strain and force more in Turkish can be considered as a reason for this. While the 17th item was in the CM group and, the 32nd and 33rd items were in the RM/V group on the original scale, in this study it was in the DT group. The content of these items is better explained by the threat of separation in Turkish. Approval was obtained from the researchers who developed the SCIRS for the addition of questions, factor distribution, and changes.

Sexual violence is also frequently encountered in abused relationship patterns. Studies show that when a form of abuse is in a relationship, women are more likely to experience sexual violence in that relationship (38–42). Therefore, if SCIRS is a valid scale for measuring sexual violence, it was expected to correlate with other scales measuring emotional violence, economic violence, physical violence, and controlling behaviors. SES-SFV, SVAWS, WHO-DVWQ were applied to the participants. Although SES-SFV measures sexual violence in the last one year or lifetime, the number of 10 questions is limited and it evaluates the types of sexual violence without detailing (15). SVAWS, on the other hand, consists of

46 questions including insults, threats, physical and sexual violence; the last 4 questions measure sexual violence (15). WHO-DVWQ questions controlling behaviors, emotional violence, moderate physical violence, severe physical violence, sexual violence, and controlling behaviors (19). With all these scales, SCIRS correlated as expected. Although sexual violence is questioned in all these scales, there is no detailed questioning of implicit sexual violence types. Therefore, SCIRS will make an important contribution to researchers in Turkey by questioning and giving the frequency of all types of sexual violence, including the type of implicit sexual violence that is most likely to be overlooked.

When men apply pressure when women do not want to have sex, they interfere with women's "goal" of stopping having sex. This situation causes negative emotions in women (43). As expected, scores in SCIRS and RS scores were negatively correlated in this study. This result shows that women who experience more sexual violence in their relationships have lower relationship satisfaction. In the study conducted by Panuzio and DiLillo, in parallel with the findings of this study, physical, psychological, and sexual violence exposure and relationship satisfaction of women in the first year of marriage were measured, and exposure to all types of violence and relationship satisfaction were found to be inversely related (44).

An important limitation is that the majority of the participants in the study were married. The reason for this may be that unmarried people were reluctant to participate in a study on sexuality and sexual violence due to their gender roles.

In summary, this is a detailed scale that measures sexual violence in intimate partner relationships, from verbal manipulation to a spectrum that includes physical bullying. It can also measure the frequency of exposure to sexual violence. We think that having this scale in Turkish will be beneficial for researchers and clinicians. In the original scale, the authors stated that the scale could be used in all cultures and types of sexual orientation, not only in western countries or to measure sexual violence in the relationships of heterosexual couples (45). This study showed that this scale can also be used in a Middle Eastern country. The scale was designed to question the last month in the form of a self-report. However, as suggested in the original scale, the scale can also be used during an interview or, depending on the researcher, to cover periods such as the last two months or the last year.

There was no conflict of interest among the authors in this study. No financial support was received from any institution in our study.

Acknowledgment: As the authors, we would like to thank Prof. Dr. Yeşim Şenol from the Department of Public Health at Akdeniz University for contributing to the statistical analysis of the study.

Ethical Committee Approval: Ethical permission was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee of Istanbul Bilgi University with the decision number 2020-40016-79 on 19.10.2020.

Informed Consent: Who gave written informed consent after the purpose of the research was explained, were included in the study.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed

Author Contributions: Concept- RG, MHY, EAY; Design- RG, MHY, EAY; Supervision- RG, MHY, EAY; Resources- RG, MHY, EAY; Materials- RG, MHY, EAY; Data Collection and/or Processing- RG, MHY, EAY; Analysis and/or Interpretation- RG, MHY, EAY; Literature Search- RG, MHY, EAY; Writing Manuscript- RG, MHY, EAY; Critical Review- RG, MHY, EAY.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declared that there is no conflict of interest.

Financial Disclosure: The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Sexual Coercion in Intimate Relationships Scale

Sexuality is an important part of romantic relationships and can sometimes be a source of conflict. Your honest responses to the following questions will contribute profoundly to what is known about sexuality in romantic relationships and may help couples improve the sexual aspects of their relationships. We appreciate that some of the questions may be uncomfortable for you to answer, but keep in mind that your responses will remain confidential.

Below is a list of acts that can occur in a romantic relationship. Please use the following scale to indicate HOW OFTEN in the past ONE month these acts have occurred in your current romantic relationship. Write the number that best represents your response in the blank space to the left of each act.

- = Act did NOT occur in the past month
- = Act occurred 1 time in the past month
- = Act occurred 2 times in the past month
- = Act occurred 3 to 5 times in the past month
- = Act occurred 6 to 10 times in the past month
- = Act occurred 11 OR MORE times in the past month

___	My partner hinted that he would withhold benefits that I depend on if I did not have sex with him.
___	My partner threatened to withhold benefits that I depend on if I did not have sex with him.
___	My partner withheld benefits that I depend on to get me to have sex with him.
___	My partner hinted that he would give me gifts or other benefits if I had sex with him.
___	My partner gave me gifts or other benefits so that I would feel obligated to have sex with him.
___	My partner reminded me of gifts or other benefits he gave me so that I would feel obligated to have sex with him.
___	My partner persisted in asking me to have sex with him, even though he knew that I did not want to.
___	My partner pressured me to have sex with him against my will.
___	My partner initiated sex with me when I was unaware (for example, I was asleep, drunk, or on medication) and continued against my will.
___	My partner threatened to physically force me to have sex with him.
___	My partner physically forced me to have sex with him.
___	My partner made me feel obligated to have sex with him.
___	My partner hinted that he would have sex with another woman if I did not have sex with him.
___	My partner threatened to have sex with another woman if I did not have sex with him.
___	My partner told me that other couples have sex more than we do, to make me feel like I should have sex with him.
___	My partner hinted that he might pursue a long-term relationship with another woman if I did not have sex with him.
___	My partner threatened to pursue a long-term relationship with another woman if I did not have sex with him.
___	My partner hinted that if I were truly committed to him I would have sex with him.
___	My partner told me that if I were truly committed to him I would have sex with him.
___	My partner hinted that if I loved him I would have sex with him.
___	My partner told me that if I loved him I would have sex with him.
___	My partner threatened violence against me if I did not have sex with him.
___	My partner threatened violence against someone or something I care about if I did not have sex with him.
___	My partner hinted that other women were interested in a relationship with him, so that I would have sex with him.
___	My partner told me that other women were interested in a relationship with him, so that I would have sex with him.
___	My partner hinted that other women were interested in having sex with him, so that I would have sex with him.
___	My partner told me that other women were interested in having sex with him, so that I would have sex with him.
___	My partner hinted that other women were willing to have sex with him, so that I would have sex with him.
___	My partner told me that other women were willing to have sex with him, so that I would have sex with him.
___	My partner hinted that it was my obligation or duty to have sex with him.
___	My partner told me that it was my obligation or duty to have sex with him.
___	My partner hinted that I was cheating on him, in an effort to get me to have sex with him.
___	My partner accused me of cheating on him, in an effort to get me to have sex with him.
___	My partner and I had sex, even though I did not want to
___	My partner forced me to do something that I found not sexually appropriate.
___	My partner showed or made me watch a pornographic picture or video, even though I stated that I did not want it.
___	My partner took a photo/video of me in underwear, nude or during sex without my consent.
___	My partner hinted he would end our relationship if I did not have sex with him.
___	My partner threatened to end our relationship if I did not have sex with him.

REFERENCES

- World report on violence and health: summary. Geneva, World Health Organization, 2002. https://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/world_report/en/summary_en.pdf
- Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu İ, Çavlin A, Akadlı Ergöçmen B. Türkiye’de kadına yönelik aile içi şiddet araştırması. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara. Basım: Elma Teknik Basım Matbaacılık; 2015.
- Kahn AS, Jackson J, Kully C, Badger K, Halvorsen J. Calling it Rape: Differences in Experiences of Women Who do or do not Label their Sexual Assault as Rape. *Psychol Women Q* 2003;27:233–242. [Crossref]
- Littleton H, Axsom D, Grills-Tauchel A. Sexual Assault Victims’ Acknowledgment Status and Revictimization Risk. *Psychol Women Q* 2009;33:34–42. [Crossref]
- Logan T, Cole J. Exploring the Intersection of Partner Stalking and Sexual Abuse. *Violence Against Women* 2011;17:904–924. [Crossref]
- Campbell R, Dworkin E, Cabral G. An Ecological Model of the Impact of Sexual Assault On Women’s Mental Health. *Trauma Violence Abuse* 2009;10:225–246. [Crossref]
- Hastuti L, Suriadi, Kardiatur T, Ligita T. The Relationship between Domestic Violence and Women’s Sexual Function in the City of Puntianak. *International Journal of Public Health Research, Special Issue* 2011;139–145. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/11492525.pdf>
- Sahin HA, Sahin HG. An unaddressed issue: domestic violence and unplanned pregnancies among pregnant women in Turkey. *Eur J Contracept Reprod Health Care* 2003;8:93–98. [Crossref]
- Clay-Warner J. The context of sexual violence: situational predictors of self-protective actions. *Violence Vict* 2003;18:543–556. [Crossref]
- Ullman SE, Townsend SM, Filipas HH, Starzynski LL. Structural Models of the Relations of Assault Severity, Social Support, Avoidance Coping, Self-Blame, and PTSD Among Sexual Assault Survivors. *Psychol Women Q* 2007;31:23–37. [Crossref]
- Finkelhor D, Yllö K. License to rape: Sexual Abuse of Wives. New York: Free Press; 1987.
- Logan TK, Walker R, Cole J. Silenced Suffering: The need for a better understanding of partner sexual violence. *Trauma Violence Abuse* 2015;16:111–135. [Crossref]
- Bagwell-Gray ME, Messing JT, Baldwin-White A. Intimate Partner Sexual Violence: A Review of Terms, Definitions, and Prevalence. *Trauma Violence Abuse* 2015;16:316–335. [Crossref]
- Sen S, Bolsoy N. Violence against women: Prevalence and risk factors in Turkish sample. *BMC Womens Health* 2017;17:1–9. [Crossref]
- Tuz C, Öksüz ME, Tekiner SA. Kadına Yönelik Şiddet Derecelendirme Ölçeği ve Mağdurların Cinsel Deneyimleri Ölçeği Türkçe versiyonunun geçerlilik ve güvenilirliği. *Euras J Fam Med* 2015;4:83–89. <http://ejfm.trakya.edu.tr/userfiles/2015/August/8-canan-tuz.pdf>
- Shackelford TK, Goetz AT. Men’s sexual coercion in intimate relationships: development and initial validation of the Sexual Coercion in Intimate Relationships scale. *Violence Vict* 2004;19:541–556. [Crossref]
- Koss MP, Oros CJ. Sexual Experiences Survey: a research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 1982;50:455–457. [Crossref]
- Marshall LL. Development of the severity of violence against women scales. *J Fam Viol* 1992;7:103–121. [Crossref]
- Garcia-Moreno C, Jansen HA, Ellsberg M, Heise L, Watts CH; WHO Multi-country Study on Women’s Health and Domestic Violence against Women Study Team. Prevalence of intimate partner violence: findings from the WHO multi-country study on women’s health and domestic violence. *Lancet* 2006;368:1260–1269. [Crossref]
- Rusbult CE, Martz JM, Agnew CR. The Investment Model Scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Pers Relatsh* 1998;5:357–391. [Crossref]
- Büyüksahin A, Hasta D, Hovardaoğlu S. İlişki İstikrarı Ölçeği: Geçerlilik ve Güvenilirlik Çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları* 2005;8:25–35. <https://toad.halileksi.net/sites/default/files/pdf/iliski-istikrari-olcegi-toad.pdf>
- UN Women. Online and ICT-facilitated violence against women and girls during COVID-19. EVAW COVID-19 briefs. United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women); 2020. <https://www.unwomen.org/-/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/library/publications/2020/brief-online-and-ict-facilitated-violence-against-women-and-girls-during-covid-19-en.pdf?la=en&vs=2519>
- Pallant J. Designing a study. In: SPSS Survival Manual 7th Ed. London: Routledge Press; 2020.
- Büyüköztürk Ş, Çokluk-Bökeoğlu Ö. Discriminant function analysis: Concept and application. *Eurasian J Educ Res* 2008;33:73–92.
- Sümer N. Yapısal Eşitlik Modelleri: Temel Kavramlar ve Örnek Uygulamalar. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları* 2000;349–74. http://www.nebisumer.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/SumerN.2000.YEM_TPY.pdf
- Horn JL. A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. *Psychometrika* 1965;30:179–185. [Crossref]
- Kağıtçıbaşı Ç, Sunar D. Family and socialization in Turkey. In: Parent-child relations in diverse cultural settings: Socialization for instrumental competency. Norwood, NJ: Ablex; 1992. p.75–88.
- Valdovinos MG, Mechanic MB. Sexual Coercion in Marriage: Narrative Accounts of Abused Mexican-American Women. *J Ethn Cult Divers Soc Work* 2017;26:326–45.
- Arciniega GM, Anderson TC, Tovar-Blank ZG, Tracey TJG. Toward a Fuller Conception of Machismo: Development of a Traditional Machismo and Caballerismo Scale. *J Couns Psychol* 2008;55:19–33. [Crossref]
- Basile KC. Prevalence of Wife Rape and Other in a Nationally Representative Sample of Women. *Violence Vict* 2002;17:511–524. [Crossref]
- DeGue S, DiLillo D. “You would if you loved me”: Toward an improved conceptual and etiological understanding of nonphysical male sexual coercion. *Aggress Violent Behav* 2005;10:513–532. [Crossref]
- Erulkar AS. The Experience of Sexual Coercion among Young People in Kenya. *Int Fam Plan Perspect* 2004;30:182–189. <https://www.guttmacher.org/journals/ipsrh/2004/experience-sexual-coercion-among-young-people-kenya>
- Sunar D. Change and continuity in the Turkish middle class family. In: Rita Liljestrom, editor. *Autonomy and Dependence in Family: Turkey and Sweden in Critical Perspective*. Taylor & Francis; 2003. p.217–238. [Crossref]
- Ayotte BL. State-control of female virginity in Turkey: the role of physicians. *J Ambul Care Manage* 2000;23:89–91. [Crossref]
- Olson RMK, Garcia-Moreno C. Virginity testing: a systematic review. *Reprod Health* 2017;14:61.
- He S, Tsang S, Li C. A revision of the sexual coercion in intimate relationships scale for young adults in China. *Violence Vict* 2013;28:483–495. [Crossref]
- Apt C, Hurlbert DF. The sexuality of women in physically abusive marriages: A comparative study. *J Fam Violence* 1993;8:57–69. [Crossref]
- DeMaris A. Elevated sexual activity in violent marriages: Hypersexuality or sexual extortion? *J Sex Res* 1997;34:361–373. [Crossref]
- Donnelly DA. Sexually Inactive Marriages. *J Sex Res* 1993;30:171–179. [Crossref]
- Hogben M, Waterman CK. Patterns of conflict resolution within relationships and coercive sexual behavior of men and women. *Sex Roles* 2000;43:341–357. [Crossref]
- Koziol-McLain J, Coates CJ, Lowenstein SR. Predictive validity of a screen for partner violence against women. *Am J Prev Med* 2001;21:93–100. [Crossref]
- Buss DM. From vigilance to violence. Tactics of mate retention in American undergraduates. *Ethol Sociobiol* 1988;9:291–317. <https://labs.la.utexas.edu/buss/files/2015/09/From-Vigilance-to-Violence-1988.pdf>
- Panuzio J, DiLillo D. Physical, Psychological, and Sexual Intimate Partner Aggression Among Newlywed Couples: Longitudinal Prediction of Marital Satisfaction. *J Fam Viol* 2010;25:689–699. [Crossref]
- Briere J, Runtz M. Post Sexual Abuse Trauma: Data and Implications for Clinical Practice. *J Interpers Viol* 1987;2:367–379.